R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 019 129 24 PS 000 857

ABSTRACTS OF RESEARCH PERTAINING TO--UNGRADED VS SELF-CONTAINED CLASSROOM ORGANIZATION IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (GRADES 1-7).

GEORGIA UNIV., ATHENS, RES. AND DEV. CTR. IN EDUC.

REPORT NUMBER INFORM-BULL-66-2 PUB DATE 21 FEB 67
REPORT NUMBER BR-5-0250
CONTRACT OEC-6-10-061
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.08 25P.

DESCRIPTORS- *UNGRADED ELEMENTARY PROGRAMS, *SELF CONTAINED CLASSROOMS, *ABSTRACTS, *RESEARCH REVIEWS (PUBLICATIONS), CLASS ORGANIZATION, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA,

THIS BULLETIN CONSISTS OF 32 ABSTRACTS WHICH ARE CONCERNED WITH THE RELATIVE MERITS OF UNGRADED AND SELF-CONTAINED CLASSROOM ORGANIZATION IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL. ABSTRACTED DOCUMENTS INCLUDE THOSE WHICH ARE (1) STATEMENTS OF PROFESSIONAL OPINION, (2) SURVEYS OF PROFESSIONAL OPINION, (3) REVIEWS OF GENERAL TRENDS OR OF SPECIFIC PROGRAMS, AND (4) REPORTS OF EVALUATIVE RESEARCH. THREE FORMATS ARE EMPLOYED. ABSTRACTS OF LITERATURE CONSISTING OF GENERAL PROGRAM REVIEWS, SUMMARIES OF RESEARCH, OR STATEMENTS OF OPINION (15 ENTRIES) ARE PRESENTED IN A FORMAT WHICH CONSISTS OF (1) CITATION, (2) PURPOSE, AND (3) AUTHOR'S COMMENTS. ELEVEN REPORTS OF RESEARCH PROJECTS ARE ABSTRACTED IN A FORMAT WHICH CONSISTS OF (1) CITATION, (2) PURPOSE AND/OR OBJECTIVE, (3) PROCEDURE, (4) RESULTS, AND (5) AUTHOR'S GENERALIZATIONS. SIX ENTRIES ARE BASED ON PREVIOUS ABSTRACT OF RESEARCH PROJECTS AND ARE PRESENTED IN A FORMAT WHICH CONSISTS OF (1) CITATION, (2) PURPOSE, (3) SOURCES OF CITED EVIDENCE, (4) SUMMAR OF CITED EVIDENCE, AND (5) AUTHOR'S GENERALIZATIONS. ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THIS BULLETIN ARE AVAILABLE FREE FROM DOYNE M. SMITH, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER IN EDUCATIONAL STIMULATION, 103 BALDWIN HALL, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA, ATHENS, GEORGIA. (JS)

BR5-0250
PA 24

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED019129

Information Bulletin 66-2

Research and Development Center

in

Educational Stimulation

University of Georgia

Athens, Georgia

February 21, 1966

Abstracts of Research Pertaining to:

UNGRADED VS SELF-CONTAINED CLASSROOM ORGANIZATION IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (GRADES 1-7)

For additional copies of this bulletin write to Doyne M. Smith Associate Director of Dissemination, Research and Development Center in Educational Stimulation, 103 Baldwin Hall, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia.

PS 000 567

II. UNGRADED VS SELF-CONTAINED CLASSROOM ORGANIZATION IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL. (GRADES 1-7)

Citation:

Delcato, Carl H. The Elementary School of the Future. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1965. 98pp.

Purpose:

To point up the end product or the ideal elementary school of the future will be.

Summary of author's comments:

1. One of the most basic changes in the promotional philosophy of the elementary school will be the gradual acceptance of the ungraded classroom unit.
2. Children's growth will be the most important evaluative criterion relative to success.
3. First three years will be composed of somewhat ungraded groups.
4. Teacher with whom children begin first grade will stay with the same class for three years.
5. At the end of the third grade children will be required to meet a minimal standard of proficiency in academic areas.
6. Children deviating emotionally, socially, or physically to the extent that they are not realizing full value from the program will be moved back to a group with whom they can grow and be happy.
7. Teacher will meet new educational program each year and through such experiences will become a master teacher.
8. Teacher and psychologist will test periodically to ascertain student growth.

* * *

Citation:

Haas, Arthur. "First-year Organization of Elmcrest Elementary School: A Nongraded Team-Teaching School," The American School Board Journal, 151:22, 70, October, 1965.

Purpose:

To review organization and first year's operation of the nongraded school.

NOTE: The school is a 33-teacher school; all furniture is on wheels. The school was designed for nongraded program.

Summary of author's comments:

1. Teachers especially selected for the program and were interviewed concerning how they would utilize facilities of the school.
2. Staff was organized into seven teams; Leadership, Resource, Kindergarten, Team I & II for six and seven-year-olds, TEAM III for eight- and nine-year-olds, Team IV for 10-and 11-year-olds.

3. 760 pupils attended, including 250 Kindergarten.
4. 7 1/2 day workshop was held to orient staff.
5. Leadership Team established coordinated nongraded reading, mathematics, and spelling groups. E.G. a reading group would include students from usual third grade level to the usual seventh grade level. Each pupil was able to function at own level.
6. Pupils were shifted according to their needs when they were ready to be shifted.
7. Three grouping methods in other areas: Diagnostic, Interest-Activity, Heterogeneous Homeroom grouping author made three points in evaluating first year: (1) Need for careful selection of staff members, (2) Need for continuous in-service program, (3) Need to keep members of community informed about the educational program.

* * *

Citation:

Christian, Mrs. Mary T. "Nongraded Pitfalls," Michigan Educational Journal, 43:42, October, 1965.

Purpose:

To warn of dangers in the trend to nongraded schools.

NOTE: Mrs. Christian is polling school administrators to determine how their perceptions of nongradedness compare, or conflict, with their practices.

Summary of author's comments:

1. Some educators simply remove grade designations and continue to group children by age, using the same texts and judging success by standard criteria.
2. Educators "talk" the nongraded concept but do not practice it.
3. Nongraded system offers best opportunity for individual development.
4. System will be no more than a label if it becomes a fad with everyone adopting it first because it is the thing to do.
5. Nongradedness calls for new testing procedures because it emphasizes concepts rather than facts.
6. Author sees need to redirect teacher training - many students don't even know about the nongraded concept.
7. Teachers must work harder in a nongraded school but the personal satisfaction is greater.

* * *

Citation:

Austin, Kent Camochan. "The Ungraded Primary Unit in Public Elementary Schools in the United States," Dissertation Abstracts, 19:73-4, July, 1958.

Purpose:

To get information concerning the development, objectives, operation, professional staff, and public relations of the ungraded primary unit.

Sources of evidence cited by the author:

Dissertation above. Based on data from questionnaires returned by schools or school systems known to be using the ungraded primary program; data from School District 163, Park Forest, Illinois. 61 ungraded primary units in Park Forest.

Summary of evidence cited by author:

1. Main objectives reported for the ungraded unit included providing for individual differences; providing for continuous, uninterrupted progress; releasing young children from stress and strain (tension) eliminating failures and needless repetitions.
2. All schools allowed additional time for slower and less mature pupils but a majority did not provide for any acceleration for the more capable and mature pupils.
3. Most schools reported flexible assignment policies.
4. Parent-teacher conference was most frequent device for informing parents.
5. Most administrators believed teachers should receive the same training as conventional graded school teacher.
6. Teachers expected to teach all areas of curriculum.
7. Both parents and teachers were generally satisfied with the operation of ungraded primary.

Generalizations proposed by the author:

1. Thorough planning, study, and discussion should precede the starting of an ungraded primary unit.
2. Complete assignment flexibility should be maintained to allow movement from group to group.
3. The ungraded primary should be recognized as an organizational scheme - not an instructional device.
4. Teacher training institutions should familiarize their trainees with the philosophy and operation of the ungraded primary unit.
5. Instructional methods previously assumed or demonstrated to be sound should be continued.

* * *

Citation:

Lobdell, Lawrence O., and William J. Van Ness. "The Self-contained Classroom in the Elementary School," The Elementary School Journal, 63:212-17, January, 1963.

Summary of author's comments:

1. From 1910-1929 interest in and use of departmentalization grew.
2. From 1930-1939 constant debate prevailed, both for and against.
3. Between 1940-1949 departmentalization declined, but more specialists began teaching music, P.E., and art.

4. The decade 1950-59 saw in increase in departmentalization, in the intermediate grades.
5. Today there is some departmentalization in primary grades.
6. There is no conclusive research evidence in favor of departmentalization.
7. "Excuses" for departmentalization are:
   (a) A willingness to experiment
   (b) A submission to pressure to "do something"
   (c) "To get the children ready" for departmentalized classes in junior high and high school
   (d) It allows subjects to be taught by a specialist
8. In classroom organization practicability alone is not enough - "which. . . is true to all we know about children?" - this is the basic question.

Citation:

Robinson, Glen, "Principals Opinions about School Organization," The National Elementary Principal, 41:39-42, November, 1961.

Purpose and/or objective:

To learn how principals across the nation view the problem of elementary school organization.

Procedure:

a. research design: Questionnaire survey
b. subjects: 721 Principals selected nation wide by a stratified-random process
c. instruments and types of scores: Questionnaire

Results:

1. 30% of principals "strongly" prefer self-contained classrooms
2. 40% "tended" to prefer self-contained classrooms
3. Adding the two above we get 70% favoring self-contained.
4. 24% tend to prefer departmentalization, 6% strongly prefer departmentalization - total of 30%.
5. The size of school districts had little variation.
6. Of the principals preferring departmentalization only 7% recommended it begin below 4th grade, almost 1/3 recommended beginning at 4th grade level, the others were almost equally divided for grades 5, 6, and 7.
7. Percent of principals favoring departmentalization for specified subjects were:

Subject	% Recommending Departmentalization
Science	61.2
Mathematics	60.7
English	54.1
Social Studies	39.7
Music and Art	27.8
Physical Education	19.8
All Subjects	13.1

(less than 10% not included)

8. Present status of schools surveyed showed: 42% having all grades self-contained, 40% self-contained except for specialist such as music and art, and 9% reported the upper grades departmentalized.
9. Of self-contained units 23% of principals reported pressure from teachers and 11% pressure from parents to departmentalize.

Generalizations by author:

The "typical" elementary school preferred by principals enrolls between 400 and 500 students, has 17-21 teachers, has a class size of 24, contains K-6 grades, and is self-contained. Departmentalization, if any, would not begin below 4th grade.

* * *

Citation:

Dean, Stuart E., "Elementary School Administration and Organization," U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bulletin 1960, No. 11, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1960.

Purpose and/or objective:

To determine practices and policies of elementary school organization and administration.

Procedure:

a. research design: survey
b. subjects: 52 carefully selected systems in cities of 10,000 or more throughout the United States (over 4,000 classrooms).
c. instruments and types of scores: Questionnaire

Results:

1. 76.5% of classrooms (grades 1-6) are self-contained, about 10% are partially departmentalized, and only about 1% completely departmentalized.
2. Over 70% of grades 7 and 8, when a part of the elementary school, have some form of departmentalization. Less than 20% of classrooms at this level are self-contained.
2. Cities of 100,000 population and above report highest use of self-contained classrooms. The 25,000 - 99,999 population centers have highest departmentalization (92.3%). (Both these for the 7th and 8th grades).
4. The region percentages of departmentalization for grades 7 and 8 are: northeast 79, north central 78.5, west 87, and the south only 57. The south is highest in self-contained classrooms.

Generalizations by author:

1. The two major conflicting viewpoints in elementary school organization are:
   A. With the vast increase in knowledge it is no longer possible for one teacher to teach all subjects effectively.
   B. The advancing science of human growth and development indicates that the elementary child needs close contact with one teacher who will be in a better position to better understand him and give individual guidance.
2. The organizational pattern is important, but what goes on in the teaching - learning situation is of "transcendent importance."

* * *

Citation:

Burnsworth, Charles C., "The Self-Contained Classroom Reconsidered." Music Educators Journal, 48:41-42, November-December, 1961.

Purpose:

To give opinions, in light of present practice, for improvement of music program in elementary grades.

Summary of author's comments:

1. Theoritically, the self-contained classroom makes sense, but practically its desirability may be questioned,
2. Most elementary teachers only get one or two courses in music for certification. Hence, the feeling that little music training is needed to teach music,
3. Most classroom teachers are not receiving adequate preparation to carry on a successful music program. The two-year normal school gave 2 to 4 times as much music preparation,
4. A full-time music teacher should be in every elementary school,
5. Many beginning elementary majors could, and should be screened to become music teachers.

* * *

Citation:

Phelps, Roger P. "Music in the Self-Contained Classroom," Music Educators Journal, 43:36-49, February-March, 1957.

Purpose:

To explore the effectiveness of music in the self-contained classroom.

Summary of author's comments:

1. A school organized on the platoon (departmental) system is more economical, hence this system was widely used during the lean years of the 1930's.
2. Some felt there was too much confusion and loss of time resulting from changing of classrooms.
3. Other faults of (departmental) classrooms were: lack of integration of subject matter, and teachers did not get to really know students.
4. Many self-contained classrooms are woefully inadequate in their music program. Few classroom teachers have both the desire and competency to teach music, art, or any of the "special subjects." It takes both!
5. Music is a skill, and skills take longer to learn than educational concepts. The self-contained classroom teacher often uses time allotted for music for other purposes since she feels incompetent and is not interested in music.
6. A qualified music teacher with a specially equipped room is needed.

* * *

Citation:

Hosley, Charles T., "Learning Outcomes of Sixth Grade Pupils Under Alternate Grade Organization Patterns," Doctor's Thesis, Stanford University, 1954. Cited in Dissertation Abstracts, 14PT1:490-91, 1954.

Procedure:

a. research design: Experimental (Pretest-Posttest)
b. subjects: 400 6th graders in departmental 6-7-8 grade school and K-6 school with self-contained classrooms.
c. instruments and types of scores: California Achievement Tests and Behavior Preference Record.
d. statistical analysis used: "T" Test

Results:

Neither pattern was superior in influencing learning outcomes, perhaps because of these factors:

1. There are no differences
2. Nature of sample
3. Time limitation of one year
4. Lack of suitable instruments to measure other areas of pupil growth.

Generalizations by author:

1. There is a need for comprehensive research over a longer period with more instruments to measure all areas of growth.
2. With special facilities pupils participate in a greater variety of activities.
3. Interest in pleasure reading is fostered by including library instruction.

* * *

Citation:

Hansen, Richard G., "A Study of Elementary School Organization." Doctor's thesis. State University of Iowa, 1953, Cited in Dissertation Abstracts, V. 14, Pt. 1, 1954, pp. 489-90.

Purpose and/or objective:

To survey teachers and prospective teachers re: two situations - first, a self-contained classroom with a maximum of 28 pupils, and second, a maximum of 38 with 250 minutes off per week for specialists to teach art, music, and P.E.

Procedure:

a. research design:
b. subjects: teachers in 10 systems prospective teachers in 4 colleges and Mason City (Iowa) schools for organizational effect.

c. instruments and types of scores: Questionnaire and interview

Results:

Data seems to support following contentions:

1. In spite of trend to self-contained classrooms many teachers prefer specialists for art, music, and P. E.
2. Self-contained classrooms were most strongly supported by those teachers who had:
   A. College degrees
   B. Least teaching experience
   C. Least experience with special teachers
   D. Best preparation in art, music, and P. E., and were
   E. Now teaching smallest classes and
   F. Teaching primary grades.
3. Students favoring self-contained classrooms were:
   A. In their first 2 years of college
   B. Planning to teach lower grades
   C. Going to be better prepared in special areas, and
   D. Felt little hesitancy to handle these subjects.
4. Departmentalization was favored by teachers who had:
   A. 2,3, or more than 4 years college
   B. The most teaching experience
   C. The most experience with specialists
   D. Slightly less preparation in art, music, and P. E., and were now teaching larger classes, and above the primary level.
5. Students favoring departmentalization were:
   A. In last years of college
   B. Planned to teach upper grades
   C. Would have less preparation in special subjects and
   D. Were more hesitant about their own ability to teach special subjects of art, music, and P.E.
6. More than half of subjects had no more than two courses in each special subject (art, music, and P. E.) hence were poorly prepared.

Generalizations by author:

Departmentalization with larger classes would make feasible special (additional) teachers and the need for fewer classrooms.

* * *

Citation:

Jarvis, Oscar T., "Door Opens in Self-Contained Classrooms to Let in Specialists." Nation's Schools, 74:33, December, 1964.

Purpose:

To report status of organization patterns in use in the intermediate grades in 64 metropolitan areas.

Summary of author's comments:

1. Completely self-contained classrooms have moved down to third place in organizations plans for intermediate grades.
2. 12% of 64 metropolitan districts expect classroom teachers to handle all subjects.
3. 2/3 of intermediate grades are self-contained classes with specialists.
4. Specialists in schools surveyed, by percent were: music, 44%; P.E., 20%; art, 14%; foreign language, 7%; reading, 5%; arithmetic, 4%; speech, 2%; English, 2%; and science, 2%.
5. 17% of intermediate grades are departmentalized.

* * *

Citation:

Lambert, Philip, Goodwin, William L., and Wiersma, William, "A Comparison of Pupil Adjustment in Team and Self-contained Organizations," The Journal of Educational Research, 58:311-14, March, 1965.

Purpose and/or objective:

To compare personal and social adjustment of students in team situation to that of a self-contained classroom.

Procedure:

a. research design: Experimental (Pre-and Post-test, 2 years.
b. subjects: Students in grades 1-6 in two schools in Madison, Wisconsin, 349 the first year and 381 the second year.
c. instruments and types of scores: California Test of Personality
d. statistical analysis used: Analysis of covariance, analysis of variance.

Results:

1. Only minor differences in adjustment were measured by the California Test of Personality.
2. The team was lower than self-contained in personal adjustment for the first year - the difference did not persist the second year.

Generalizations by author:

1. Since the difference did not persist some doubt is cast on importance of first year's significant differences.
2. Conclusion: ". . . no organizational effects on pupil adjustment, or . . . instruments used are not sensitive to such differences."

* * *

Citation:

Broadhead, Fred C., "Pupil-Adjustment in the Semi-departmental Elementary School," Elementary School Journal, 60:385-90, April, 1960.

Purpose and/or objective:

To determine differences in adjustment between fifth graders in semi-departmental and self-contained classrooms.

Procedure:

a. research design: experimental (comparing subjects with test norms)
b. subjects: 831 fifth-graders who had been in Tulsa's semi-departmental classrooms from first grade.
c. instruments and types of scores: The Junior Inventory - Form S.
d. statistical analysis used: Comparison of mean and decile scores - and feasible statistical methods.

Results:

1. In each of five areas of the Junior Inventory: school, home, myself, people and things in general, boys and girls both indicated higher levels of adjustment (.01 level) for semi-departmental pupils over the norms for self-contained classrooms.
2. Adjustment in "School" area of test was considerably higher than in other areas.
3. In semi-departmental classes girls showed better adjustment than boys. Nearly all mean and decile scores of girls indicated better adjustment in most areas of the inventory.

Generalizations by author:

Since the scores were not inferior to norm groups, the semi-departmental type organization must not in itself promote poor adjustment in school children.

* * *

Citation:

Rouse, Margaret, "A Comparison of Curriculum Practices in Departmental and Nondepartmental Schools," Elementary School Journal, 47:34-42, Sept., 1946.

Purpose and/or objective:

To discover differences, if any, between departmental and (self-contained) organizations at the fourth and fifth grade level of: classroom teaching procedures, curriculum practices, and scope of school program.

Procedure:

a. research design: Survey
b. subjects: 20 departmentals and 20 nondepartmental schools, selected at random.
c. instruments and types of scores: Questionnaire, interview, observations.

Results:

1. Statistically significant differences favoring departmental were:
   A. Writing taught as a formal subject,
   B. Music as separate subject,
   C. Curriculum based on subjects,
   D. Most periods per day 8.55 vs 6.9,
   E. Uniform period length,
   F. Number of interruptions (5.6 vs .75),
   G. Formal oral reading.
2. Nondepartmental (self-contained) schools were favored by:
   A. Safety practice participation,
   B. Correlated curriculum organizations,
   C. Grouping for reading instructions,
   D. Oral reports in language classes,
   E. Use of visual aids in social studies class,
   F. Correlation of art with other activities.

Generalizations by author:

1. Only one difference favoring departmental is approved by specialist - that of music as a separate subject.
2. All seven of the differences favoring nondepartmental organization were "approved by specialist."
3. Schools - "are not so different in actual practice as the theories underlying the various types of organizations seem to indicate."

* * *

Citation:

Dunn, Mary, "Should There be Any Set Type of Elementary School Organization?" Elementary School Journal, 53:199-206, December, 1952.

Purpose and/or objective:

To determine how needs of children can best be served through organizations of instruction.

Procedure:

a. research design: Survey
b. subjects: School systems of 63 cities thruout the United States.
c. instruments and types of scores: Questionnaire

Results

1. The one-teacher (self-contained) classroom was predominate thruout the thirty year period (1920-50), and it gained in popularity in the last decade.
2. During the 1920's experimentation and search for solution to over-crowding gave better case for platoon school and departmentalization. Achievement in subject matter ranked high in the minds of educators.
3. In the decade of the '30's conflicting contentions prevailed. Advocates of both self-contained and departmental plans claimed the same advantages.
4. The 1940's saw an emphasis on "total-child growth and development," and a gain in following for the self-contained classroom.

Generalizations by author:

Opposing parties claim better discipline fixed teacher responsibility and better learning experiences for children.

* * *

Citation:

Gibb, E. Glenadine and Matals, Dorothy C., "Study on the Use of Special Teachers of Science and Mathematics in Grades 5 and 6." School Science and Mathematics, 62:565-85, November, 1962.

Purpose and/or objective:

To learn if Science and Mathematics can be taught more effectively by special teachers.

Procedure:

a. research design:
b. subjects: 48 sections of 5th and 6th graders, in 4 different school systems.
c. instruments and types of scores: Sequential tests of Educational Progress; Otis Quick-Scoring Mental Ability Test
d. statistical analysis used: Analysis of Variance of gain scores

Results:

1. There was no significant difference in gains scores in mathematics by either method (self-contained vs departmental)
2. Sixth graders in science with special teachers (departmentalized) made significantly greater gains over the self-contained.
3. Self-contained 5th grades in social studies made greater gain than newly departmentalized 5th graders, but for 6th graders in the one-year study and 5th graders in the two-year study (departmental) this was not true.
4. There was no evidence of students being biased toward science or mathematics.

5. There was a significant preference for several teachers (departmental) by the students, and by 6th graders a strong preference. Some systems favored self-contained while others favored departmental organization.
6. Departmental 6th graders achieved greater success in both mathematics and science than self-contained groups. It was similiarly true in grade 5 but not significantly so.

Generalizations by author:

1. Here's evidence that students learn science more effectively with special teachers than in self-contained classrooms.
2. Regardless of ability departmental science teaching is best for all children.
3. There's no reason to believe either plan more effective for mathematics, regardless of ability.
4. The most effective teacher is the one competent in her subject and who understands children.
5. Special teachers in science and in mathematics did not place a handicap on the total school program.
6. "Good teachers are effective regardless of organization."

* * *

Citation:

Halliwell, Joseph W., "A Comparison of Pupil Achievement in Graded and Nongraded Primary Rooms," The Journal of Experimental Education, 32:59-64, Feb. 1963.

Purpose and/or objective:

To determine whether there would be a significant gain in the achievement of primary grade pupils after a variation of the nongraded primary unit was adopted; to compare achievement in reading and spelling of students after one year under nongraded with students in graded classes.

Procedure:

a. research design: Descriptive
b. subjects: 146 primary students who had been in nongraded for one year; 149 primary pupils from graded framework
c. instruments and types of scores: Cal. Achievement Test (1SF); Metropolitan Achievement Test (2nd & 3rd); Large-Thorndike Intelligence Test (nonverbal)
d. statistical analysis used: Central tendencies, variability T Test. G. P. Scores

Results:

Nongraded pupils in first grade obtained significantly higher achievement scores in word knowledge and reading comprehension on CAT - significant at

.01 level. At second grade level, only in arithmetic was the difference significant. Favor of nongraded with sig. at .01 level in arithmetic computation and spelling; in arithmetic problem solving the difference was significant at .05 level.
All differences favored nongraded.

Generalizations by author:

Although the nongraded was used only in reading and spelling, the gains in arithmetic were as great if not greater. Concomitant changes in methods, materials and attitudes occurred in addition to organizational change. It would seem that nongraded teaching of reading and spelling proved quite effective and is worthy of further investigation.
Note: Nongraded had been in operation for only eight months at time of study.

* * *

Citation:

Studler, Cecilia B., "Grouping Practices," The National Elementary Principal, 40:147-158, September, 1960.

Purpose:

To describe and to evaluate the grouping practice in nongraded elementary schools.

Summary of author's comments:

1. Largely confined to primary unit.
2. Specifically designed to eliminate retardation in the primary grades (years) by organizing according to reading level.
3. Superior students are assigned to a classroom covering four levels of reading (readiness, pre-primer, primer, first reader).
4. All pupils progress to another room at end of year...May be up or down!
5. Evaluation:
   A. Research has been limited to answering one question at the time.
   B. Teachers like nongraded plan.
   C. Some parents refuse to accept the system.
   D. Need information on effects of the plan upon self-concept and motivational systems.
   E. Nongraded plan has substituted level standards for grade standards.
   F. Nongraded plan is based upon ability grouping.
   G. Effect of errors of placement upon the self-concept of children needs to be examined.
   H. Writer did not advocate extension of the plan into the intermediate years.

* * *

Citation:

Suttle, John E. "The Non-Graded Elementary School," Curriculum Bulletin, 18:12-19, 1962.

Purpose:

To report findings from survey of literature regarding instructional organization patterns.

Summary of author's comments:

1. The nongraded type of school has emerged as a form believed to be more consistent with findings related to pupil variations; a form in which continuous progress may take place.
2. Increasing number of elementary schools switching to nongraded.
3. Survey results showed:
   A. Primary unit (so named by U.S.O.E.) being used by almost one-fifth of urban placed in country.
   B. Most common pattern was either K-3 or 1-3.
   C. 13 percent of urban places not using form indicated its possible future adoption.
   D. Exploration has been limited almost entirely to grades below the fourth.
4. Not enough research to make conclusive comparison of the graded VS nongraded.
5. Advocates of nongraded plan agree that much has yet to be learned regarding the way in which the increased flexibility can best be utilized.

* * *

Citation:

Bockrath, Sister M. Bernarda, "An Evaluation of the Ungraded Primary as an Organizational Device for Improving Learning in Louis Archdioceson Schools," Dissertation Abstracts, 19:2819-20, 1959

Purpose:

To determine if this organizational device has resulted in better reading; to report specific findings of a three-year study of a group of children as they proceed through the primary program; to ascertain through a survey of the primary teachers if the program has contributed to an improved teacher-learning situation.

Sources of evidence cited by the author:

Dissertation above.

Summary of evidence cited by author:

1. Fourth grade reading scores of 1956 showed 5 months increase over 1953 fourth grade (median increase)

2. Higher percent overachieving in 1956 and lower underachieving in 1956.
3. Slow-learning children made scores comparable to rapid learners when adequate time was given for mastery.
4. Twelve children went into fifth grade at end of third year.

Generalizations proposed by the author:

Overwhelming majority of teachers agreed that the ungraded program did contribute to more affective learning and to teacher growth.

* * *

Citation:

Enwoldsen, Corwin Leonard, "An Evaluation of the Ungraded Primary Program in Selected Schools in the Lincoln Nebraska Public School System," Dissertation Abstracts, 22:3054-5, March, 1962.

Purpose:

To determine the degree of success of the ungraded primary program as developed in Lincoln, Nebraska, in relation to pupil achievements and pupil attitude toward school.

Sources of evidence cited by the author:

Dissertation referred to in citation above.

Summary of evidence cited by author:

1. Significant difference found in favor of Graded in arithmetic reasoning and arithmetic total.
2. In top 35, no significant difference.
3. In bottom 35, significant difference in favor of Graded in reading vocabulary, arithmetic reasoning, arithmetic total, and total battery (California).
4. In p-4's the third grade retentions, significants difference in favor of ungraded in arithmetic fundamentals.
5. In attitude toward school, no attempt to control intelligence; no significant difference in total group.

Generalizations proposed by the author:

1. Principals, teachers, and parents favored the ungraded.
2. No significant difference in academic achievement.
3. Twenty-four fourth year (retained) students in the Graded program; nine P-4 students in ungraded.
4. Strong permanent teachers should continue with one group of pupils through complete primary program (experimentally).

* * *

Citation:

Eldred, Donald M. & Maurice Hillson, "The Non-Graded School and Mental Health", The Elementary School Journal, 63:218-222, January, 1963.

Purpose:

To point out some ways in which the non-graded school organization provides for individualized instruction and furnished emotional nourishments needed for mental health.

Summary of author's comments:

1. The whole organizational structure of the school has been inimical to individual differences.
2. Elementary school structure has been especially inappropriate.
3. The basic system of school organization has contributed to personality maladjustment, mental illness, juvenile delinquency, crime, and a host of similar problems.
4. Sense of worth will be developed through non-graded organizations as result of being able to "catch up" to achieve.
5. Non-graded organization offers opportunities to meet the need of an individual to feel he is succeeding.
6. Feeling of being accepted is nourished in non-graded.
7. Non-graded methods promote idea of love and concern on part of teacher for student.
8. The non-graded system offers opportunities to find new friends.

* * *

Citation:

Dean, Stuart F., "The Nongraded School: Is There Magic in It?" School Life, 47:19-23, December, 1964

Purpose:

To discuss briefly some pro and con suggestions taken from observation and from reports of educators and researchers as these pertain to the nongraded organization.

Summary of author's comments:

1. Too early to determine decisively whether nongraded organization is success or failure.
2. Very few truly nongraded schools exist.
3. Success of the nongraded system is determined in the classroom (not intrinsically successful from organization).
4. The nongraded school may do many good things.
5. Cautioned about readiness for program: sound policy for reporting progress, communication between levels, pupil mobility, record keeping, teacher qualification.

6. PROS:

A. Provides for individual differences
B. Flexibility in administration is offered
C. Abolished artificial barriers of grades & promotion
D. Promotes improved mental health
E. Respects continuity of learning
F. Stimulates curriculum revision
G. Is in harmony with democratic society
H. Administratively feasible for all ages
I. Is program oriented
J. It permits pupil to progress at own rate

CONS:

A. It leads to soft pedagogy
B. It places impossible burden on teacher
C. It replaces grade requirements by reading levels
D. It results in lack of information to parents
E. It is difficult to put into practice
F. It does not have minimal standards for all children.
G. Its curriculum sequence seems to lack specificity and order
H. It is improved means to unimproved end
I. It does not guarantee improved teaching
J. Suffers from misuse of "nongraded"

* * *

Citation:

Hickey, Sister Mary Paul, "An Analysis and Evaluation of the Ungraded Primary Program in the Diocese of Pittsburg," Dissertation Abstract, 23:2817, February 1963.

Purpose:

To analyze and evaluate the ungraded primary program of the Diocese of Pittsburg.

Sources of evidence cited by the author:

Dissertation referred to in citation above.
(Four graded and four ungraded schools)
(Study involved 745 ungraded and 603 graded pupils)

Summary of evidence cited by author:

1. Nongraded scored significantly higher in reading achievement, arithmetic computation, problem solving.
2. High intellectual ability benefited most in arithmetic.

3. Consistently higher correlation between achievement and I. Q. in the ungraded.
4. No significant difference in personal adjustment.
5. Large number of teachers expressed preference for teaching in the ungraded program.

Generalizations proposed by the author:

1. Ungraded pupils were achieving better scholastically (3 yr. in program)
2. Capabilities of every individual were provided for in the ungraded program.
3. Personal adjustment not affected.
4. Teachers believed students achieved better in ungraded.
5. Parents thought ungraded schools were superior.

* * *

Citation:

Buffie, Edward George, "A Comparison of Mental Health and Academic Achievement: The Ungraded Versus the Graded School," Dissertation Abstracts, 23:4255, May, 1963.

Purpose:

To determine whether differences in mental health and academic achievement, as measured by tests, between control groups (graded) and experimental groups (ungraded) were significant.

Sources of evidence cited by the author:

Unpublished doctoral dissertation shown in citation above.

Summary of evidence cited by author:

1. In all eleven areas of mental health and academic achievement, tested, results favored ungraded.
2. In three areas, there was significant difference in academic achievement at .01 level; in two of mental health there was significant difference at .05 level.

Generalizations proposed by the author:

1. Evidence supported claims by proponents of nongraded system as to academic achievement and general adjustment.
2. Children attending under rationale of the nongraded primary seemed to be clearly superior in areas of language and work-study skills as well as in overall academic composite score.
3. Trend apparent to indicate better adjustment in the nongraded primary.
4. No claim made for having established causal effects.

* * *

Citation:

Kelly, Florence C. "A Ten Year Report: Ungraded Primary Schools Make the Grade." NEA Journal, 40:645-6, December, 1951.

Purpose:

To discuss some strengths and weaknesses of the ungraded primary program after ten years of its operation in Milwaukee.

Summary of author's comments:

1. Program was organized in January, 1942.
2. Children of similar chronological age and social maturity are kept together.
3. They remain in these groupings for six semesters.
4. No grade levels; time is recorded in terms of the number of semesters above kindergarten--each group leaving kindergarten becomes P-1.
5. No child is kept in primary school beyond P-8.
6. Stigma of failure removed.

Five cardinal principles:

1. Orient teachers and parents.
2. Initiate the program with groups coming from kindergarten unwise to "ungrade" those students who have been "graded."
3. Start in one school--for at least one year.
4. Continue parent program for each new group.

Two problems considered in grouping: social and learning grouping.

Faculty understanding on part of teachers must be guarded against.

Milwaukee primary has done much to meet individual needs of children.

* * *

Citation:

Polkinghorne, Ada R. "Parents and Teachers Appraise Primary-Grade Grouping," Elementary School Journal, 51:271-8, January, 1951.

Purpose:

To present evidence of research done on the ungraded primary in the Laboratory School, University of Chicago.

Sources of evidence cited by the author:

Questionnaire information from responses given by 130 primary-group parents, 60 third-grade parents.

Summary of evidence cited by author:

1. Most parents liked having children with same teacher for two years.
2. Most parents were satisfied with progress their children made in areas of learning listed in questionnaire.
3. Most children in primary group look forward to going to school.
4. Most parents were pleased with amount of individual help their children received.
5. It seemed evident that most of these children made an easy adjustment to grade III.
6. Half the third-grade parents thought that their children's experience in primary group helped their adjustment in Grade III.
7. Forty-eight parents wrote enthusiastically about the ungraded primary as a whole, although not asked to. Nineteen said they were against the plan. Teacher--only shop and art teachers said that pupils didn't adjust as well as those from straight second grade room. Median intelligence quotient 6 to 9 points lower than before plan was started, but achievement test scores were slightly higher.

Generalizations proposed by the author:

It seems that the primary grouping hasn't damaged the children insofar as academic achievement is concerned.

* * *

Citation:

Hunter, Madeline. "The Dimensions of Nongrading," The Elementary School Journal, 65:20-25, October, 1964.

Purpose:

To explore some basis for the nongraded school organization.

Summary of author's comments:

1. In sound education there is no one way.
2. Good modern education must be based on selection from alternatives.
3. Philosophy of wise choice is basic to concept of nongraded school.
4. In nongraded schools teachers are forced to assume responsibility for providing appropriate learning opportunities.
5. The nongraded school requires consideration of many dimensions: (a) teaching style, (b) peer group, (c) the educational program. The author classes these as dimensions that can be manipulated.
6. Two necessary conditions: First, alternatives in style of teaching, in peer group, and in the program. Second, a sound diagnosis must be made and used in selecting alternatives. Teachers must know students better than most students are known. Author states that these concepts are inherent in nongraded system philosophy - not in the organizational plan.
7. Three fundamental premises: (1) individual differences; (2) Materials that are inappropriate or partially learned are not only wasteful but they interfere with previous and future learning; (3) It is wasteful to idle a child's mind while others catch up. Quality education is not inherent in the organizational plan of nongrading but can result from the wise application of the philosophy of nongrading.

Citation:

Lorenre, Louis F. and Ruth Salter. "Cooperative Research on the Nongraded Primary," Elementary School Journal, 65:269-277, February, 1965.

Purpose:

To give composite picture, based on research of literature, of the primary school without grades.

To indicate extent of research on nongrading and to describe a cooperative experimental study comparing graded and nongraded schools now operating.

Summary of author's comments:

Working definition: The nongraded units is an administrative device for putting into practice a democratic philosophy that emphasizes the value of the individual child.

1. No grade levels.
2. Curriculum organized in sequential work units of achievement - not of time.
3. Promotion is on individual progress.
4. Flexible intra-class grouping.

Findings from literature reviewed by author:

(1) Six studies had compared reading achievement primarily in Grades 3, 4, 5, 6. Four found achievement of nongraded to be significantly superior to that of graded. One found graded control group to achieve superior to nongraded. One found no difference.

(2) Five studies concerned with arithmetic achievement. Four favored nongraded; one favored graded.

All three comparisons in spelling favored nongraded. Basic claims of nongraded still need testing; findings not conclusive. Based on short time experiences.

NOTE: Checked as many of findings as were available in our library. This article had good bibliography but materials not here.

* * *

Citation:

Goodlad, John I., et. al. "Reading Levels Replace Grades in the Nongraded Plan." Elementary School Journal, 57:253-6, November, 1957.

Purpose:

To attempt to clarify some problems and procedures that accompany the change to nongrading.

Summary of author's comments:

1. Nongrading grows out of dissatisfaction with some other aspect of schooling.
2. Two classification problems present themselves: first, grouping to determine classroom unit; second, grouping within the classroom.
3. Three principles to be used in grouping:
   (a) Pupils should stay with a teacher for at least a year
   (b) There should be normal range of ability in each group
   (c) Pupils should be grouped as closely as possible by chronological age
4. Chief burden is that of educating parents and teachers.
5. Things to consider in initiating program:
   (a) Developing understanding first
   (b) Move one step at a time
   (c) Try to see an actual model early in planning
   (d) Once the first step is taken, go all the way
   (e) Rigorous record keeping and testing are essential
   (f) Stick to instructional methods previously assumed to be sound
   (g) Experiment - nongrading in itself is little more than door opening

* * *

Citation:

Blackstock, Cecilia Roan. "A Field Study to Initiate an Ungraded Primary School in Brozasport," Dissertation Abstracts, 22:2258-9, January, 1962.

Purpose:

To study schools that had successfully inaugurated ungraded primary units; to establish similarities between pertinent factors between Brozosport and these other schools; and to recommend a program for initiating the ungraded primary unit in Brozosport.

Sources of evidence cited by the author:

Published literature from systems utilizing ungraded system; questionnaire information.

Summary of evidence cited by author:

1. No evidence that school size, organization, or community complexity has any bearing on success.
2. Initiation of idea may come from any level.
3. Teachers' understanding and acceptance pre-requisite.
4. Informing and convincing parents and board of education is important step.
5. One school or all within a system may be ungraded with comparable success.
6. Teachers may remain with a group of students for one or more years.
7. Parent-teacher conferences preferred for reporting.
8. The ungraded program has wholly or partially accomplished the following objectives: